

Very precious

THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, APRIL, 1909.

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Oregon, Washington, and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, 24 Concord Avenue, Cambridge.

**Massachusetts Association Opposed to
the Further Extension of
Suffrage to Women.**

Thirty-five Branch Committees; 14,163 members in 245 cities, towns, and villages.

MRS. G. HOWLAND SHAW, President.

MRS. J. RANDOLPH COOLIDGE,

MISS ANNA L. DAWES,

MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD,

MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS,

MISS AGNES IRWIN,

MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer,
Walnut Street, Brookline.

MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Rec. Sec'y.

MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y,
24 Concord Avenue, Cambridge.

Vice-Presidents.

A PROPOSED SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT.

ONLY one suffrage petition was presented to the Massachusetts Legislature this year, a petition signed by Mrs. Julia Ward Howe and others, asking for an amendment to the Constitution striking the word "male" from the qualifications for voters.

The Committee on Constitutional Amendments granted a hearing upon this petition February 23. The room in which the hearing was held was crowded, and the suffragists, in imitation of the English "suffragettes," and with the personal aid of two members of that militant group, Miss Costello and Miss Rendell, held an open-air meeting, at first on the State House steps and later on the Common,

and addressed the crowd which gathered.

At the hearing the cause of the petitioners was presented by Mrs. Theresa Crowley, John F. Tobin, Rabbi Charles Fleischer, Miss Alice Stone Blackwell, Rev. Anna H. Shaw, and others. Charles R. Saunders, Esq., of Boston, counsel for the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women, conducted the case for the remonstrants.

Mrs. Gorham Dana, of Brookline, in behalf of the Association, read the following

Remonstrance Against the Petition.

TO THE COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee, — Our Association appears once more before a committee of the Massachusetts Legislature simply in self-defense. For more than fifty years attempts have been made each winter to obtain some form of woman suffrage, which Massachusetts legislatures have been too wise to grant. Our Association is composed of more than fourteen thousand women who have associated themselves together to resist such attempts. They are women of twenty-one years and upwards and they belong to two hundred and forty-five cities, towns, and villages from Berkshire to Cape Cod. They belong to all classes and conditions of life. Many of them are tax-paying women. Others are wage-earners, dependent on their daily labor, either of hand or brain. Their reasons for protesting against woman suffrage may vary with the circumstances of their lives, but they unite in the belief that it would be injurious both to women themselves and to the state.

We are here in behalf of our own association and of all other women who wish to retain their existing rights and exemptions, and who prefer to intrust the politics of the state to men rather than to women.

The men of Massachusetts have always considered the welfare and wishes of her women. Our laws have

been changed again and again for their protection and benefit, and they stand to-day as a proof that the interests of women can safely be intrusted to those who now enact our legislation.

Indeed, our only fear is that the generosity toward women which so distinguishes American men may induce some legislature to listen too favorably to such petitions as are presented here to-day, simply because the petitioners are women.

We ask you, therefore, to remember the wishes of the women throughout the state who would be injured by the change proposed. These women have no desire to secure the rights of men; neither do they wish to assume their duties. If you doubt this, we ask you to consult the women in your own homes and in your neighborhood. Do the women you know wish to attend town meetings? Are they anxious to go to caucuses? Do you believe they desire to take their share in jury service? Do they believe it is for the welfare of the state that they should assume your present duties while still retaining their own?

We are often told that if woman suffrage were granted those women who wished the ballot could use it and that other women would receive no injury.

Our presence here to-day, gentlemen, proves that argument untrue. We are here much against our wishes, simply to counteract the efforts of other women with whom we totally disagree.

In the same way, were we made voters, we should be constantly called upon to offset the votes of women whose action we considered dangerous to the prosperity of the state.

We are also told how easy it is to deposit a ballot, as if nothing more were required.

But, gentlemen, we doubt if you share that opinion.

The amendment to the constitution which is asked for to-day would introduce women to all the political controversies hitherto confined to men.

They would be expected to attend town meetings and to be present at political caucuses.

Women now stand outside politics. We are neither Republicans nor Democrats, and, therefore, our suggestions and requests in matters of education, charity, and reform are welcomed and heeded. No suspicion arises that we have partisan ends to serve.

For many years the services of women have been welcomed and sought in almost every movement for local benefit or reform. Village and town improvement societies all over the state are largely composed of women. It has become almost an exception when any public library does not count them among its trustees. They serve upon school committees in towns where their election has come almost exclusively by the votes of men. They are chosen as overseers of the poor and as trustees of city institutions of various kinds, both for the care of paupers and of children. They are appointed by the governor on boards of hospitals, of charities and prisons. In all these posts the only questions now concern a woman's fitness and good judgment. Her opinion has equal value with a Republican official or with a Democratic. No one asks her views of national administration or her opinion of tariff reform or protection. They do not concern her duties or affect her relations with men of either party.

Women are willing and ready to do their share in public and charitable work; they desire that their suggestions shall be valued in the future as in the past by officials and legislators. We believe that it is for the welfare of the state that they should stand on neutral ground, safe from all attempts to draw them into the opposing camps.

We believe you will agree with us that such a momentous change should not be lightly made and that it is not required by the best interests either of women or of the state.

MASSACHUSETTS ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO THE FURTHER EXTENSION OF SUFFRAGE TO WOMEN.
By Mrs. G. HOWLAND SHAW,
President.

Professor William T. Sedgwick, of the Institute of Technology, was then called upon and spoke in substance as follows:

I appear as a remonstrant because I hold that the proposed legislation is against the best interests of the state. I regard the woman suffrage movement as a retrograde movement, a backward step in the process of

civilization, because the development of sex, like that of civilization, is in effect a differentiation of function, a physiological division of labor, and anything which seeks to efface natural differentiation of function or to produce identity instead of division of labor is a backward step. Equality of privilege, equality of opportunity, equality of rank, all these are to be desired and sought for. Coöperation also between men and women upon committees of many kinds; coöperation in good works, public and private, here as everywhere is a keynote of progress, and sensible men have long since welcomed such coöperation on the part of able, unselfish women. Such coöperation does not imply or involve equality or identity of function, but rather wholesome inequalities or differences which, by contributing various points of view, various degrees of insight, give a resultant superior to the mere addition of so many duplicating or identical units.

The progress of civilization has, as a rule, assigned to men certain fundamental functions, such as those of government, politics, war, police duty, jury duty, seafaring, mining, and other heavy or dangerous forms of labor, and I believe that the actual participation of women in any of these functions would be a backward step.

That women are different from men and, therefore, entitled to special protection under the law as to hours of labor is shown by the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the well-known Oregon case.

As for the question of wages and the ballot, any argument that these go together is puerile. If they did, should we not long since have voted to raise all men's wages and to abolish all hard times? There are higher laws than those made by man, namely, the laws of nature, and these will be obeyed whether we vote or do not vote. Beneath all government, all politics, lies force, the final arbiter, of which the ballot is simply the sign manual, the token and the pledge, to be cast only and always with the understanding that if need be it shall be redeemed by the sword.

The next speaker was

Mrs. A. J. George, of Brookline, who said in substance:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee, — The proposition before you to-day provides for the striking out of the word "male" from the constitution of Massachusetts in the qualifications of voters.

Many women honestly believe that the economic status of woman, owing to her entrance into industry, has so altered her relation to the social order that she needs the vote. This argument of course applies only to the wage-earning woman. Any woman who to-day is careless of the welfare of woman in industry is guilty of nothing short of criminal negligence. By the census of 1900 there were more than five million wage-earning women in this country. But one third of these are less than twenty-one years of age and cease to be wage-earners at about the time they reach the voting age. The position of women as industrial workers is essentially temporary because "marriage terminates the occupational career," to quote from the census. This shifting of the woman from wage-earning to home-making, her short duration in industry and consequent lack of skill, have much to do with her low wage. Only five and six-tenths per cent of the married women are in gainful occupations. Not one woman in six of the women in the United States over twenty-one years of age belongs to the wage-earning group. Of the five million who are in industry, one million are agricultural laborers, two millions are in domestic and personal service, half a million are in professional service, so that nearly sixty-six per cent of the entire body of wage-earning women are in those occupations least organized under trade unions, and so less able to combine individual opinions in a way to influence industrial legislation. Because woman is physically and nervously limited in power, because her nervous force is less stable than man's, she is in industry to-day, not as an industrial person, but as an industrial woman for whom special legislation is necessary in order to protect her who is the hope and promise of the race which is to come.

Now we are asked to create a body of voters with special privileges, just as we have a body of industrial workers who have need of special legislation. Woman is limited along the lines where the voter, the lawmaker, must be strong. In all departments where the laws are to be applied and enforced, woman's nature forbids her entrance. Already women are doing valuable work on boards of hospitals and libraries and asylums, where the methods of administration demanded are those of domestic life rather than of politics and government; the casting of a ballot is the signing of a contract which implies vast responsi-

bility and tireless attention. It is the following of a ballot to its last conclusion that makes the body politic sound. The ambitious suffragist, when given her ballot, will have many a municipality to cleanse, many a fire to fight, many a street to police, many a prison to order, many a gambling den to raid, many a battle to win. Do the women who ask for these changes represent the majority of the women of this Commonwealth? We believe they do not.

Charles R. Saunders, Esq.,
of Boston, said in part:

It is clear that suffrage is not a right. If it were, how could we justify the condition of the 350,000 inhabitants of the District of Columbia who have no voice whatever in choosing those who administer the local government and levy taxes on their property? Massachusetts does not allow those who cannot read and write, or paupers, to vote. If suffrage were a natural right, would it not be an outrage to deprive these poor unfortunates of it who have never had the advantage of an education or who have already lost all their property?

To portray a person who cannot read and write, a pauper, a lunatic, a criminal, an Indian, a Chinaman, and an intelligent woman and entitle the picture, "American Woman and Her Political Peers," may deceive the unthinking, but others will ask, "Does the picture include all who do not have the ballot?" and, "Is their non-participation in the suffrage for the same reason?" To complete the picture there must be added a portrait of Alexander Hamilton at the age of eighteen when he wrote his papers in defense of the rights of the Colonies, which were at first taken for the production of John Jay; but Hamilton could not vote at that age. There must be added also the portraits of Carl Schurz and a host of other intelligent foreigners during the five years after their arrival in this country.

These various classes are without the ballot for entirely different reasons. A person who cannot read and write is debarred from the suffrage because he has not the ordinary means for acquiring information as to candidates and policies; a pauper, because one who is dependent on the charity of the community should not dictate its policy and determine how much shall be allotted for his support; a lunatic, because unable to understand; a criminal, because an enemy of

society; an Indian, because of his tribal relation; a Chinaman, because forbidden naturalization; young men under twenty-one, because not considered of sufficient maturity of judgment; the most intelligent foreigner must live here five years before voting, because not deemed before that time sufficiently identified with our institutions. Women are without the ballot, *not for any of the above reasons*, but because, in that court of last resort, physical force, upon which all stable government rests in its final analysis, they cannot maintain the laws which their ballots might enact; and the making of laws without the power to enforce them leads the way to anarchy.

An Adverse Report.

The Committee on Constitutional Amendments voted against the amendment, 8 to 3. Twelve years ago, in 1897, the committee voted in favor of the amendment, 9 to 2, but the report was rejected by the legislature.

Overwhelmingly Defeated in the House.

March 23, by special assignment, the report was taken up in the House, and a motion to substitute the amendment for the report was defeated by a vote, counting pairs, of 54 yeas to 171 nays. As is shown by the comparison elsewhere printed, this is the largest majority in the House against a suffrage amendment for more than a dozen years.

Concurrent Action in the Senate.

In the Senate, March 26, the adverse report of the Committee on the amendment was accepted without debate or a division.

THE ENGLISH ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS.

THE Women's National Anti-Suffrage League is growing rapidly in membership and influence, thanks in part to the violent demonstrations of the "suffragettes" which have occasioned a reaction in public sentiment. The League, at last accounts, had 65 branches, and about as many more were in process of organization. March 18 the League presented to the House of Commons a petition against woman suffrage, signed by 243,852

women. These signatures were obtained in little over six months' work.

A "Men's League for Opposing Woman Suffrage" has been organized to cooperate with the Woman's League. The Earl of Cromer has accepted the presidency, Lord Welby and Mr. Heber Hart are treasurers, and among those who have consented to be vice-presidents are Sir William Anson, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, M.P., Sir Edward Clarke, the Earl of Dunraven, Admiral Sir Edmund Fremantle, Lord George Hamilton, Lord Haversham, Lord James of Hereford, Mr. Rudyard Kipling, Sir Ray Lankester, Sir Alfred Lyall, the Bishop of Manchester, the Duke of Montrose, Lieutenant-General Sir Arthur Paget, the Earl of Pembroke, the Poet Laureate, Sir William Ramsay, Lord Ridley, Mr. Briton Riviere, R. A., the Earl of Ronaldshay, Lord Rothschild, Mr. G. W. E. Russell, Lord Stalbridge, and Lord Weardale.

SOME SUFFRAGE DISAPPOINTMENTS THIS YEAR.

A PROPOSED constitutional amendment was defeated in the California Assembly January 28, after a strenuous campaign by the suffragists. To carry, it should have had 54 votes; it received but 39, to 37 in the negative.

In Kansas, February 17, a presidential suffrage bill was defeated in the House.

In Oklahoma, February 17, the Senate rejected a proposed suffrage amendment by a vote of 15 yeas to 21 nays.

In Iowa, March 11, the Senate voted, 37 to 11, to postpone indefinitely a resolution providing for the submission of a constitutional amendment, and by a vote of 36 to 12 defeated a minor suffrage measure relating to the voting of women in referendum matters.

In Minnesota, March 11, a proposed constitutional amendment was indefinitely postponed in the House by a vote of 59 to 46, and a bill for a referendum upon the question was defeated, 79 to 27.

In Rhode Island the committee on special legislation reported adversely upon a presidential suffrage bill, March 11, and the House accepted the report without a roll-call.

In New York the judiciary committee of the Assembly, March 10, voted, 11 to 2, not to report the proposed suffrage amendment to the Constitution.

"IN PROCESS OF DEFEAT."

SUFFRAGISTS who objected to the statement in the January REMONSTRANCE that the facts justified Mrs. Humphry Ward's assertion that the suffrage movement in the United States was "in process of defeat" are invited to consider the figures of the vote in Massachusetts legislatures since 1897 upon proposed suffrage amendments to the constitution.

In 1904 and 1908 no amendment resolve was introduced; and in 1900, 1903, 1905, 1906, and 1907 there was no roll-call. In the other years the adverse majorities in the House were as follows:

1897.....	33	1901.....	101
1898.....	53	1902.....	92
1899.....	51	1909.....	117

It is a striking and instructive fact that the present year, in which the suffrage campaign was noisiest, most aggressive, and imitative of the English "suffragette" methods, the majority against suffrage is the largest, and this with only fourteen members of the House unrecorded.

PREMATURE REJOICING.

A GREAT deal of enthusiasm and a good many columns of newspaper space have been wasted during the last few weeks in suffragist rejoicing over the announcement that Sweden had granted full suffrage to women. From the remoter parts of the country exultant letters and articles continue to come in, pointing the backward United States to the example of Sweden.

But it is all a mistake, originating in a carelessly-worded cablegram, which the suffragists seized upon without due investigation. What Sweden has actually done is merely this: Hitherto strict property qualifications have so restricted the suffrage in Sweden that less than seven per cent of the men have been permitted to vote; under the new franchise reform bill, which has been passed for the second time by the Riksdag, and has thus become law, every Swedish man will have the ballot. This applies, however, only to the second chamber; the old re-

strictions apply to elections for the first chamber, which corresponds to the Senate in American legislatures.

THE IMMIGRANT WOMAN.

At the hearing before the Joint Judiciary Committee of the New York Legislature, February 24, Miss Mary Dean Adams, investigator for the New York State Commission of Immigration, read a paper upon the immigrant woman in her relation to the ballot. She said that she had always found the immigrant woman affectionate and sympathetic, an unselfish wife and mother, and an industrious worker; but that of affairs of public interest she knows nothing and cares nothing. Miss Adams continued:

"A large proportion of these new arrivals can neither read nor write their own language. Many who have been here as long as a year cannot tell the number or name of the street in which they live.

"The immigrant woman is a fickle, impulsive creature, irresponsible, very superstitious, ruled absolutely by emotion, and intensely personal in her point of view. She would be capable of understanding just about as much of matters political as a man born deaf and blind would of the opera.

"The ignorant woman who is absolutely incapable of understanding anything of government and who has never held any property would be very quick to see and take advantage of the commercial value of a vote.

"A few weeks ago I asked a man who is a naturalized alien and active labor organizer what effect he thought suffrage would have on his countrywomen. He laughed. 'Ha! ha!' said he; 'why, she would sell her vote for a pound of macaroni.'"

SOUTH DAKOTA AND WASHINGTON.

THE legislatures of South Dakota and Washington have adopted resolves under which constitutional amendments to admit women to the full suffrage will be submitted to the voters at the elections in November, 1910.

Experience should teach the suffragists that it is one thing to induce a legislature to submit such amendments, and quite another to secure their acceptance by the people. During the last eleven years constitutional amendments to admit women to the suffrage have been submitted to the vote of the people six times in various states and rejected in every instance.

AN ANTI-SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION IN PHILADELPHIA.

AN "Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women" was organized in Philadelphia March 27. Mrs. John Markoe accepted the position of president temporarily, and the other officers elected were: Mrs. Brinton Coxe, secretary, and Miss Elise Willing Balch, treasurer. The following committee was appointed: Mrs. George F. Baer, Mrs. Horace Brock, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt, Mrs. Alexander J. D. Dixon, Mrs. Joseph M. Fox, Mrs. William A. Glasgow, Jr., Mrs. Horace Binney Hare, Mrs. James Mifflin, Mrs. Arthur Ryerson, Mrs. John Thompson Spencer, Mrs. Henry Wharton, Jr., Mrs. Nicholas Thouron, Mrs. Howard Wurts Page, Miss Mary Henry, Miss Mary Newhall, and Miss Gertrude McCall.

Rev. Anna Shaw upon Ex-President Roosevelt.

[From the Boston Herald, Feb. 24, 1909.]

MISS SHAW paid her respects to President Roosevelt. She does not approve of the President's attitude on the suffrage question.

"He's going to Africa now," she said, "to kill lions. It wouldn't be such a great loss if he came back inside of a lion."

A FAIR EXCHANGE.

[From the Boston Herald, March 2, 1909.]

To the Editor of the Herald,—I should like to call the attention of Boston and Massachusetts people to the great kindness of the two English college girls, Miss Rendell and Miss Costello, in coming over to assist our legislators in arriving at a decision upon the important subject of woman suffrage. They understand thoroughly, of course, American conditions, and their ripe wisdom should be eagerly sought by our lawmakers. As a delicate recognition of the value of their services, I wish to suggest that some arrangement be made by which a couple of Harvard students be sent over to England during the spring or summer vacation to assist English statesmen in solving the many difficult and perplexing problems which confront England to-day. Being mere men, they could not of course, be of the service these two girls might have been if they had stayed at home to advise their own government, but doubtless they would do their best to point out to the English their proper course of action.

CAMBRIDGE.

M. C. R.